



Docket No. 884.523US1

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Appellant: Madhav Datta

Serial No.: 09/961,036

Filed: September 21, 2001

Title: DUAL-STACK, BALL-LIMITING METALLURGY AND METHOD OF
MAKING SAME

Examining Group: 2813

Examiner: Erik J. Kielin

APPELLANT'S BRIEF

MS Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

January 5, 2004

RECEIVED
JAN 15 2004
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Sir:

Appellant herein submits a Brief in triplicate in accordance with the provisions of 37 CFR §1.192 within a five (5) month period from the filing date of the Notice of Appeal submitted August 4, 2003, and with the requisite fee under 37 CFR §1.17(c) on filing a Brief in support of the Appeal.

The following items are provided with the headings and in the order as required by 37 CFR §1.192(c).

1. REAL PARTY OF INTEREST

In accordance with 37 CFR §1.192(c)(1) requiring identification of the real party of interest in the application, the real party of entire right, title and interest is INTEL CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation doing business at 2200 Mission College Blvd., Santa Clara, CA .

2. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In accordance with 37 CFR §1.1 92(c)(2) requiring identification of all other appeals and interferences which would have any bearing on the Board's Decision in the present Appeal, to the best knowledge of Appellant, there have not been and are not any other Appeals, and no Interferences, based on the subject application.

3. STATUS OF CLAIMS

In accordance with 37 CFR §1.192(c)(3) requiring a statement of the status of all claims, pending and cancelled, Appellant submits the following:

Claims 1-45 have been advanced during the prosecution history of the application, except for claims 1-16, which have been cancelled. Claims 20, 22, 24, and 26-45 have been withdrawn from consideration under several restriction requirements. In any event, claims 17-45 and are pending.

The Examiner previously maintained objections to the drawings and the specification, but no rejection of the claims resulted in these objections. Appellant has repeatedly traversed these objections. Because the objections did not appear in the Advisory Action, mailed on 25 August 2003, Appellant considers the objections to be withdrawn.

Claims 17-19, 21, 23, and 25 stand finally rejected under 35 USC §103:

Claims 17-19, 21, 23, and 25 have been rejected and/or have been given a final rejection, and accordingly, the jurisdictional prerequisite under 37 CFR §1.191 for Appeal from the Decision of the Examiner to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences has been met. In view of the requirements under 37 CFR §1.191 that an Appeal in an application or reexamination preceding identify, when the Appeal is taken, all rejected claim or claims which are to be appealed and proposed to be contested, Appellant respectfully submits that all presently rejected claims (Claims 17-19, 21, 23, and 25) are appealed.

4. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The following is a statement of the status of any Amendments filed subsequent to final rejection (as required by 37 CFR §1.192(c)(4)).

The application was originally filed on September 21, 2001, with claims 1-30.

Election and Preliminary Amendment was filed on June 13, 2002, with new claims 31-45.

Election and Preliminary Amendment was filed on September 27, 2002.

Appellant's Response Under 37 CFR §1.116 After Final Rejection filed July 14, 2003 has been acted upon by the Examiner and treated in an Advisory Action dated July 25, 2003, with the following effect:

The Response was deemed not to place the application in condition for allowance, for the reasons set forth in the attachment to the Advisory Action. The reasons stated "The applied art teaches and/or suggests the claimed invention." No mention was made of the objections and consequently, Appellant considers the objections withdrawn. Appellant provides arguments, however, addressing the objections should the Examiner consider reinstating them. With respect to the Advisory Action, the Examiner did not indicate whether the Response would be entered for purposes of Appeal, it is respectfully submitted that such paper should have been entered in view of the fact that a notice of appeal was filed on August 4, 2003.

5. SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

A concise explanation of the claimed embodiments defined in the claims in the Appeal, which refers to the specification by page and line number and to the drawings by reference characters (as required by 37 CFR §1.192(c)(5)), is detailed as follows.

A claimed embodiment includes a process. Reference can be made to FIGs. 3-9 and to independent claim 17 for illustration of a summarized embodiment.

The process includes forming a metallization (14). The process further includes forming a refractory metal first layer (26) over the metallization (14). The process further includes forming a refractory metal second layer (28) over the refractory metal first layer (26). The process further includes forming a refractory metal third layer (30) above and on the refractory metal second layer (28), and the refractory metal third layer (30) is substantially the same metal as the refractory metal first layer (26). The process further includes forming a refractory metal fourth layer (32) above and on the refractory metal third layer (30), and the refractory metal fourth layer (32) is substantially the same metal as the refractory metal second layer (28). Subsequently, the process includes forming an electrically connective bump (42) above the refractory metal fourth layer (32).

6. ISSUES

In accordance with 37 CFR §1.192(d)(6), the following is a concise statement of the issues presented for review.

(1) ISSUE: Whether the Patent Examiner misconstrued the plain meaning of claim 18 by ascribing a unique meaning thereto, that is not found in the four corners of Appellant's disclosure.

(2) ISSUE: Whether the Patent Examiner erred in rejecting claims 17, 19, 21, 23, and 25 under 35 USC §103 where a prima facie case of obviousness was not established.

7. GROUPING OF CLAIMS

It is understood from 37 CFR §1.192(c)(7) that, for each ground of rejection which Appellant contests and which applies to more than one claim, it will be presumed that the rejected claims stand or fall together unless a statement is included that the rejected claims do not stand or fall together. Appellant asserts that the claims 17, 19, 21, 23, and 25 are to be considered separately for purposes of this appeal. Each claim should be reviewed separately, and the claims do not stand or fall together.

8. ARGUMENT

The contentions of Appellant with respect to the issue presented for review in the foregoing Item 6 and the basis therefor, with citations of the authorities, statutes, and parts of the record relied on, (as required by 37 CFR §1.192(c)(8)), are provided as follows, with each issue being treated under a separate heading.

For each rejection under 35 USC § 103, Appellant's argument specifies (as required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)(iv)) the errors in the rejection and why the rejected claims are patentable under 35 USC §103, including any specific limitations in the rejected claims which are not described in the prior art relied upon in the rejection.

All descriptions of Appellant's disclosed and claimed embodiments, and all descriptions and rebuttal arguments regarding the applied references, as previously submitted by Appellant in any form, are repeated and incorporated herein by reference. Further, all Office Action statements regarding the objections and rejections are respectfully traversed. Further,

Appellant submits the following.

A) The Applicable Law

“A patent may not be obtained...if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art.” 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

A determination of the obviousness or nonobviousness of claimed subject matter is a legal conclusion based on several factual inquiries. These include determining the scope and content of the prior art, ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue, and resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 148 USPQ 459, 467 (1966); *Winner International Royalty Corp. v. Wang*, 53 USPQ2d 1580, 1586 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

In ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims, courts are required to consider the claimed invention as a whole. *Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.*, 1 USPQ2d 1593, 1597 (Fed. Cir. 1987). It is impermissible to use the claimed invention as a “template” to piece together the teachings of the prior art to render the claimed invention obvious. *In re Fritch*, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1784 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The claims must be interpreted in light of the specification, claim language, other claims, and prosecution history. *Panduit*, 1 USPQ2d at 1597. A §103 reference must also be considered in its entirety, “including portions that would lead away from the invention.” *Id.* A court must consider not only the similarities, but also the “critical differences between the claimed invention and the prior art.” *In re Bond*, 15 USPQ2d 1566, 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In establishing obviousness, two or more references each containing elements of the claimed invention may be combined, provided all the recited claim elements are met and that there is a suggestion, teaching or motivation to combine the references. *In re Dembiczak*, 50 USPQ2d 1614, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Further, even if the prior art provides such a suggestion, motivation or teaching, there must be a reasonable expectation of success for the suggested combination. *In re Vaeck*, 20 USPQ2d 1438, 1442 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

B) ARGUMENT: The Objection to the Drawings under 37 CFR §1.83(a) is improper as the Examiner has ascribed a unique meaning to claim 18 that is not found in the four corners of the disclosure, nor that is understood by one of ordinary skill in the art.

The Examiner may have withdrawn the objection. For the sake of economical use of Appellant's resources, Appellant provides a traversal and argument against this objection.

The Examiner appears to assume that the scope of claim 18, always requires six metallization layers present, e.g. "the *uppermost* metal layer M6" (Office Action at page 5, emphasis in original). This assumption is in error and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner developed of a unique, imaginative, and obscure meaning for claim 18 that is not disclosed or intended. This unique meaning has grown to "it is not conventional to somehow form a contact pad *below* other metal layers." (Ibid., emphasis in original). Under this unique meaning developed by the Examiner, the objection might be meretorious.

Appellant, however, considers the plain meaning, as supported by the figures and claim 18, not to be part of this unique meaning that has been developed by the Examiner.

Claim 18 describes no such unique meaning, nor does the balance of Appellant's disclosure. Claim 18 enumerates a range from "wherein the copper metallization pad makes contact with a metallization selected from a range of metal-one (M1) to M6", i.e., M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, and M6. The disclosure does not assert, as the Examiner suggests, that the copper metallization pad could be in contact with a lower metallization. If the upper metallization were to be an M1, claim 18 covers this limitation. If the upper metallization were to be an M2, claim 18 covers this limitation, etc. That Appellant did not illustrate any metallization because they are conventional, supports the plain meaning of claim 18. Appellant respectfully requests that the Board overturn the Examiner's objections.

Objection to the Drawings under 37 CFR §1.83(a)

If the Office Action reinstates an objection to the specification, the objection to claim 18 should be withdrawn because of the Examiner's unique characterization of claim 18, as set forth above. Appellant respectfully requests that the Board overturn the Examiner's objections.

C) ARGUMENT: Claims 17-19, 21, 23, and 25 are patentable over the cited references under 35 USC §103 because the Examiner has not established a prima facie case of obviousness.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 17, 19, 21, 23 and 25 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwala et al. (U.S. 5,376,584) in view of Yi et al. (U.S. 6,348,730).

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Appellant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (M.P.E.P. § 2143 8th Ed).

The specific limitations in the rejected claims are not described in the cited references relied on in the rejection.

The combination of Agarwalla with Yi does not teach all the limitations of claim 17. The Examiner admitted "Agarwala '584 does not indicate the nature of a phased metal layer ... that the phased metal layer [24] includes a first and third layers of substantially the same metal and the second and fourth metals of substantially the same metal." (Office Action at page 5). The Examiner looked to Yi '730 to remedy this deficiency. The Examiner's statements regarding the teachings of Yi, however, are in error.

The Examiner dismissed out of hand (Office Action at page 7) Yi's teaching at column 3, lines 5-14, which states in pertinent part,

a first metal layer, a third metal layer and a phased layer therebetween. The phased layer includes second and fourth metal layers made of the same material as the first and third metal layers, respectively

(Yi at column 3, lines 5-14). Yi's second and fourth metal layers are necessarily the same as

Yi's first and third metal layers, respectively. In Yi, this means chromium on chromium and copper on copper, and this cannot be construed to teach the limitations of Appellant's claim 17. Yi's teaching is verified in Yi's FIGs. 9 and 10. For example, Yi invariably teaches Cr 51, which is Yi's "first metal layer", touches only Cr 151, which is Yi's "second metal layer" and Cu 55, which is Yi's "third metal layer", touches only Cu 155, which is Yi's "fourth metal layer". The scheme of first touching second and being the same metal, and fourth touching third and being the same metal, also applies to FIG. 10. Yi's naming of metal layers is semi-arbitrary. Although Yi's names: "first", "second", "fourth", and "third" are normally used as sequentials, Yi's third metal layer 55 is last in sequence of four metals, and consequently Yi's "third" metal layer is the fourth in sequence.

Claim 17 requires in pertinent part "forming a refractory metal fourth layer above and on the refractory metal third layer, wherein the refractory metal fourth layer is substantially the same metal as the refractory metal second layer" The Examiner falsely construed Yi's fourth metal layer 155 (Cu) to be above and on Yi's third metal layer 55 (Cu), while he asserted Yi's fourth metal layer 155 (Cu) to be substantially the same metal as Yi's second metal layer 151 (Cr). Appellant respectfully requests that the Board overturn the Examiner's rejection.

When one applies the teaching of Yi to Agarwalla, one does not reach what is claimed. Further, the motivation to combine Yi with Agarwalla, in view of what they actually teach, comes only from Appellant's disclosure.

Because the specific limitations in the rejected claims are not described in the cited references relied on in the rejection, these limitations render claim 17 unobvious over Yi in view of Agarwalla. Appellant respectfully requests that the Board overturn the Examiner's rejection.

The cited references taken as a whole do not suggest the claimed subject matter.

The Examiner at page 7, continued to mischaracterize Yi's teachings by referring to sequences "first, third, fifth, etc. metal layer (each designated as 151) . . . and second, fourth, sixth, etc. metal layer (each designated as 155) to be of the same metal." (Office Action at page 7). But this is not correct. As set forth above, Yi teaches sequentially first, second, fourth, and third metal layers, and invariably only in that order. Further, Yi invariably teaches the third metal layer 55 is above and on the fourth metal layer 155. Appellant respectfully requests that

the Board overturn the Examiner's rejection.

The Examiner errantly asserted that "Yi teaches that a *phased metal layer is composed of alternating layers of two different metals* and consequently explains to one of ordinary skill what the phased metal layer of Agarwalla is likely to look like and how it may be made." (Office Action at pages 6 and 7, emphasis added).

But this is not correct. Yi never teaches "alternating layers of two different metals" (Office Action at page 6). Yi teaches in great detail, several layers of identical metal, alternated by several layers of a different metal. Yi teaches

in further detail, eight chrome layers 151, two copper layers 155, seven chrome layers 151, three copper layers 155, six chrome layers 151, four copper layers 155, five chrome layers 151, five copper layers 155, four chrome layers 151, six copper layers 155, three chrome layers 151, seven copper layers 155, two chrome layers 151, eight copper layers 155, are deposited in sequence.

(Yi at column 4, lines 42-49, emphases added). Consequently, Yi teaches some 70 metal layers are formed in a sequence, but never "alternating layers of two different metals" (Office Action at page 6).

The Examiner also characterized these 70 or so metal layers of Yi as single metal layers of alternating chromium and copper. (Office Action at page 7). This assertion is disingenuous and should be overturned. The Examiner contorted the plain meaning of Yi. As set forth above, Yi teaches, e.g. one of the structures includes "eight chrome layers 151, two copper layers 155" etc. The Examiner disingenously asserted that Yi means a single metal layer is composed of laminates, only to

determine the thickness of the layer (either 151 or 155) and are accordingly a single layers (sic) of metal *of varying thickness* as Yi states at col. 4, lines 37-42,

'The chrome layers 151 get thinner from the chrome layer 51 toward the copper layer 55, while the copper layers 155 get thicker from the chrome layer 51 toward copper layer 55.'

(Office action at page 7). Incidentally, even Yi's statement is at variance with Yi's FIG. 9. The copper layers 155 indeed begin to increase in number and to become as composites, increasingly thicker structures. For example, tracking upwardly toward copper layer 55, Yi

teaches two layers 155, three layers 155, four layers 155, and five layers 155. But then the copper layers 155 begin to decrease in number and to become, as composites, increasingly thinner structures. Continuing to track upwardly from the five layers 155, Yi's composite copper layers include four layers 155, three layers 155, and two layers 155 below and on the copper layer 55. Appellant respectfully requests that the Board overturn the Examiner's rejection.

The Examiner tried to reinforce his assertion that "the individual laminates with a given layer, 151 or 155, are not shown to change thickness." (Office Action at page 7). But the Examiner has put too fine a point on this assertion since Yi does not mention anything to support it. Further, if the Examiner would pull out his meter stick and actually compare the thicknesses of each of Yi's top two layers 155, to each of Yi's bottom two layers 155, the Examiner would find the top layers are approximately 33% thicker. Although Appellant does not consider this to be material to the Examiner's failure to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, Appellant has discussed this assertion to show the Examiner's unsupported assertions.

The Examiner next asserted "Yi does teach that the third metal layer is in direct contact with the second metal layer and the that fourth metal layer is in direct contact with the third, etcetera, in any phased metal layer." (Office Action at pages 7 and 8). This mischaracterization of what Yi teaches has been dealt with above, and the rejection should be overturned.

The Examiner concluded with a recitation of some limitations of claim 17, in particular asserting "Applicant appears to be arguing a limitation absent in Yi which is not presently claimed." (Office Action at page 8). As set forth above, Appellant respectfully asserts Yi teaches a feature that does not match the limitation of claim 17. Appellant respectfully requests that the Board overturn the Examiner's rejection.

Because the cited references when combined, do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, Appellant respectfully requests that the Board overturn the Examiner's rejection.

Appellant notes that claims 19, 21, 23, and 25 depend from claim 17 and include other limitations that make them separately patentable over claim 17. The combined teachings of Agarwala '584 with Yi, fail to teach all the limitations of these claims as set forth above.

APPELLANT'S BRIEF

Serial Number: 09/961036

Filing Date: September 21, 2001

Title: DUAL-STACK, BALL-LIMITING METALLURGY AND METHOD OF MAKING SAME

Page 11

Dkt: 884.523US1

Because the cited references when combined, do not teach or suggest all the claims' limitations, Appellant respectfully requests that the Board overturn the Examiner's rejection.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwala et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,376,584) in view of Yi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,348,730 B1) as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Microelectronics Packaging Handbook, Semiconductor Packaging, Part II, 2nd edition, Tummala et al. eds., Kluwer Academic Publishers: Boston, 1997, pp. 132-139. Appellant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests the Board to consider the following.

The deficiencies of Agarwala '584 and Yi as set forth above are incorporated herein by reference. The Examiner cited to Tummala et al. eds., to teach "that it is notoriously well known (1) for the bonding pad to be copper (p. 137, last paragraph, and Fig. 8-6 on p. 138), as well as (2) for the bond pad to attach to one of the metallization layers (the third metallization layer as shown in Fig. 8-2, on p. 133). The Appellant agrees in principle, but not in the instance of Tummala. Tummala illustrates a no-bond pad metallization; the 2.3 micron Al-4% Cu is in direct contact with a Cr layer. Because all the claim limitations are not taught by the cited references, Appellant respectfully requests that the Board overturn the Examiner's rejection.

Referring again to the rejection of claim 18, Appellant notes that Tummala et al., does nothing to remedy the failure of Agarwala '584 and Yi to teach what is claimed in claim 17, from which claim 18 depends.

Because the cited references when combined, do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, Appellant respectfully requests that the Board overturn the Examiner's rejection.

For the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully submits that the rejection of the claims on appeal was erroneous. Appellant earnestly requests the Board to overturn the Examiner's final rejections.

DECISION REGARDING ORAL HEARING DELAYED

As permitted by the provision of 37 CFR § 1.194, Appellant will delay a final decision on oral argument until after review of the Examiner's Answer.

APPELLANT'S BRIEF

Serial Number: 09/961036

Filing Date: September 21, 2001

Title: DUAL-STACK, BALL-LIMITING METALLURGY AND METHOD OF MAKING SAME

Page 12

Dkt: 884.523US1

Please charge Deposit Account No. 19-0743 in the amount of \$ 330.00 to cover the fee for filing this Appeal Brief. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

MADHAV DATTA ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
612-349-9592

Date Jan. 5, 2004

By Ann M. McCrackin
Ann M. McCrackin
Reg. No. 42,858

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Appeal Brief – Patents, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 5th day of January, 2004.

Anne M. Richards

Name

Anne M. Richards
Signature

9. APPENDIX

As required by 37 CFR §1.192(c)(9), Appellant's APPENDIX containing the claims involved in the Appeal is provided on separate sheets attached hereto.

17. A process comprising:
 - forming a metallization;
 - forming a refractory metal first layer over the metallization;
 - forming a refractory metal second layer over the refractory metal first layer;
 - forming a refractory metal third layer above and on the refractory metal second layer, wherein the refractory metal third layer is substantially the same metal as the refractory metal first layer;
 - forming a refractory metal fourth layer above and on the refractory metal third layer, wherein the refractory metal fourth layer is substantially the same metal as the refractory metal second layer; and
 - forming an electrically connective bump above the refractory metal fourth layer.
18. The process according to claim 17, wherein forming a metallization comprises:
 - forming a copper metallization pad over a substrate, wherein the copper metallization pad makes contact with a metallization selected from a range of metal-one (M1) to M6.
19. The process according to claim 17, wherein forming a refractory metal first layer over the metallization comprises:
 - depositing the refractory metal first layer by physical vapor deposition of a composition selected from Ni, Co, Pd, Pt, Ti, Zr, Hf, Cr, Mo, W, Sc, Y, La, and Ce.
21. The process according to claim 17, wherein forming a refractory metal second layer over the refractory metal first layer comprises:
 - depositing the refractory metal second layer by physical vapor deposition of a composition selected from Ni, Co, Pd, Pt, NiV, CoV, PdV, PtV, Ti, Zr, Hf, Cr, Mo, W, Sc, Y, La, and Ce in a solid-solution or stoichiometric ratio.

23. The process according to claim 17, wherein forming a refractory metal third layer over the metallization comprises: depositing the refractory metal third layer by physical vapor deposition.

25. The process according to claim 17, wherein forming a refractory metal fourth layer over the refractory metal first layer comprises:

depositing the refractory metal fourth layer by physical vapor deposition.